DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 028 697 HE 000 509

Confrontation or Participation? The Federal Government and the Student Community. A Report to the President of the United States by the White House Fellows Association.

White House Fellows Association.

Pub Date Oct 68

Note-32p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.70

Descriptors-*Activism, *Communication Problems, Federal Government, *Governmental Structure, Political Attitudes, *Social Change, *Student Attitudes, Student Participation

In May 1968, President Johnson called upon the White House Fellows Association to develop a plan for bringing outstanding college students to Washington for a series of seminars with government leaders on key issues of the times. The resulting study revealed that communications channels between the federal government and students in the US were inadequate, and that students felt this communications problem to be symptomatic of a more pervasive problem: a general weakening of the sense of "community" in the twentieth century. While young people are criticizing today's America, they are also forging the questions and themes for the America of tomorrow. Activist students, in their attempts to bring about change in institutional structures, are adhering either to confrontation politics--which reflects the belief that US institutions cannot be changed by working within the system but must be confronted from without and forcefully brought to a halt-- or to the politics of participation, which involves working within the system to produce change. The form of change that eventually takes place will depend on 3 factors: the type of leadership that emerges, the capacity of institutions to develop new procedures that provide for student participation, and a personal commitment similar to that of the students. The 9 recommendations in the report represent a synthesis of suggestions from students and faculty at approximately 80 institutions throughout the US. (WM)

ED028697

CONFRONTATION OR PARTICIPATION?

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND THE STUDENT COMMUNITY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A REPORT TO
THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES
BY THE WHITE HOUSE FELLOWS ASSOCIATION
OCTOBER 1968

HE 5.210:

THE WHITE HOUSE FELLOWS ASSOCIATION/1965-1968

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

WALTER J. HUMANN, President
TIMOTHY E. WIRTH, First Vice President
JAMES P. MALONEY, Second Vice President
DORIS H. KEARNS, Secretary
WILLIAM S. ABBOTT, Treasurer
HAROLD A. RICHMAN, Representative (1965–1966)
CHARLES D. RAVENEL, Representative (1966–1967)
GERARD L. SNYDER, Representative (1967–1968)

MEMBERSHIP

WALTER S. BAER
RICHARD E. BALZHISER
JOHN W. BASSETT
JANE P. CAHILL
RICHARD D. COPAKEN
WILLIAM R. COTTER
THOMAS E. CRONIN
BARBARA CURRIER
JOHN A. DeLUCA
RICHARD L. De NEUFVILLE
JAN T. DYKMAN
BARNES H. ELLIS
EDWIN B. FIRMAGE
JOSEPH FREITAS
DONALD A. FURTADO
JOHN E. HAVELOCK
SAMUEL H. HOWARD
WILLIAM P. GRAHAM
SANFORD D. GREENBERG
ROBERT P. HUEFNER
THOMAS O. JONES
W. THOMAS JOHNSON, JR.
PETER F. KROGH
ROBERT R. LEE
RONALD B. LEE
BETSY LEVIN
F. PIERCE LINAWEAVER
CHARLES M. MAGUIRE
JOHN W. McCARTER
J. TIMOTHY McGINLEY
JOHN M. McGINTY
DAVID C. MULFORD
HOWARD N. NEMEROVSKI
HOWARD N. NEWMAN
ROBERT E. PATRICELLI
LT. COL. JOHN S. PUSTAY
HAROLD P. SMITH
PRESTON M. TOWNLEY
THOMAS VEBLEN
MICHAEL H. WALSH
KIMON S. ZACHOS

CONFRONTATION OR PARTICIPATION?

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND THE STUDENT COMMUNITY

A REPORT TO

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

BY THE WHITE HOUSE FELLOWS ASSOCIATION

OCTOBER 1968

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Letter of Transmittal

I. Mandate and Summary

II. Basic Findings

III. Recommendations

1. A Special Assistant or Office Within the Executive Office of the President.
2. A National Advisory Commission on Youth.
3. The Establishment of Offices of Youth in Departments and Agencies.
4. Review of the Training Process for Young Employees in the Federal Service.
5. The "President's Students in Residence" Program.
6. The Appointment of Youth to National Advisory Committees.
7. The Encouragement of Governor's Fellows and Mayor's Fellows Programs.
8. A Cooperative Policy Study Program.
9. A National Television Series.

IV. Appendix: The Research Effort

OCTOBER 1968.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT:

We have the honor of presenting the Report of the White House Fellows Association, responding to the request which you made in the Commencement address at Texas Christian University on May 29, 1968.

In your speech you stated that: "I believe that leaders in government can contribute to the education of this college generation. I should like to see outstanding leaders from the junior classes in the colleges all over America come to Washington each year, for direct discussions with government leaders on these key issues of our times that we must find the answers to. I would like to see them spend, without losing credit, a month to 6 weeks in Washington each Spring—deepening their understanding of the problems and prospects we face."

You called upon "the White House Fellows—young citizens who have served a year at the highest levels of our Government—to develop a plan for accomplishing this, and to submit their plan to me in the early Fall."

We began our research effort by soliciting the ideas and judgment of hundreds of students and faculty in approximately 80 academic institutions located throughout the country. As we discussed with them your specific recommendation, the deeper problem which lay beneath your request emerged: the inadequacy of the channels of communications and understanding between the government and the student community. Therefore our report attempts to analyze both your initial recommendation and the underlying factors involved in the communications problem.

We believe that efforts must be undertaken to increase understanding and participation between the Federal Government and the student community. By making these efforts, the Nation can better utilize one of its greatest national resources—its youth.

We have concluded that the most immediate efforts should concentrate on developing procedures to increase student participation and involvement in our established institutions. We realize that no single mechanism will meet the need. Therefore we have recommended a variety of specific actions, in addition to the one you suggested.

These program recommendations are:

1. A Special Assistant or Office Within the Executive Office of the President.
2. A National Advisory Commission on Youth.
3. The Establishment of Offices of Youth in Departments and Agencies.
4. Review of the Training Process for Young Employees in the Federal Service.
5. The "President's Students in Residence" Program.
6. The Appointment of Youth to National Advisory Committees.
7. The Encouragement of Governor's Fellows and Mayor's Fellows Programs.
8. A Cooperative Policy Study Program.
9. A National Television Series.

As many of these ideas and recommendations came from students, we hope that the American student community will read this report with a sense of participation.

We would like to express our appreciation to you for the opportunity to concentrate our collective efforts on this critical problem. Our 49 members responded to your request with enthusiasm and diligence; they brought to bear an expertise and judgment which was no doubt in large part due to their opportunity to serve as White House Fellows. We hope this report indicates the promise of the Association. We stand ready to serve our Nation and its leadership at any time.

Respectfully,

Walter J. Humann

WALTER J. HUMANN,
For the White House Fellows Association.

I. THE MANDATE AND SUMMARY

Mandate. This report began with President Johnson's charge to the White House Fellows Association to develop a plan for bringing outstanding college students to Washington for a series of seminars with government leaders. As the members of the Association delved into this specific mandate, the report took on a broader direction. It became an exploration into the deeper themes that lay behind the President's request—the themes of participation and understanding. How might more students participate more constructively in the work of the Federal Government? What kind of mechanisms could be developed to increase understanding between the Federal Government and the student community? It is to these broader concerns of participation and understanding that we turn our attention in this report.

Summary. We found at the outset a widely shared feeling among many different groups of students that the channels of communication between the Federal Government and the student community are inadequate. The frustration is easy to observe; the reasons for it are more difficult to ascertain. It is our impression that to many, young and old, black and white, today's communications problem is symptomatic of a more pervasive problem: a general weakening of the sense of "community" in the twentieth century.

Ours is an age of general restlessness. It is an age in which virtually everything is changing, even the givens upon which children are brought up. It is an age of kaleidoscopic shifts in values and beliefs and of marked disparities between our expectations of contemporary institutions and these institutions' delivery capacity. All of these elements taken together have produced a loss of moorings, and a widespread, albeit inarticulate, sentiment for change.

At this juncture, the struggle for changing our institutions to meet our shifting values is manned for the most part by the younger generation. In part, this can be attributed to the university, a specialized subculture which sets large numbers of young people apart from the mainstream of American society. In part it can be attributed to the simple question of time: because he doesn't have such pressing concerns about earning an income, raising a family and developing a career, the young person can take the time to look at the system, question it and attempt to change it before becoming a part of it.

Among the younger generation of activist students, the attempt to bring about change in our institutional structures has generally taken one of two forms: the politics of confrontation and the politics of participation. Confrontation politics reflects the belief that institutions cannot be changed by working within the system; institutions must be confronted from without and brought to a halt. In contrast, participatory politics reflects the belief that American institutions can be changed by working within the system if the right levers of change can be tapped and utilized.

Whether we as a society experience the politics of confrontation or the politics of participation will depend in large part on three factors: the type of leadership that emerges, the capacity of our institutions to develop procedures that will enable those urging change to be a part of the process of change and the degree of sustained and unselfish personal commitment exhibited by those who are demanding change. With these three factors—leadership, procedures and personal commitment—as our benchmark, we recommend a series of actions that the government might take to open the path for more constructive participation by youth.

We urge these actions neither as remedial solvents to a "youth problem" nor as techniques to create a new cadre of "youth bureaucrats" but rather as steps to open the government to a greater utilization of the talents, energies, spirit and idealism of its younger generation. We make no brief for setting youth aside *qua* youth for special treatment. Young people are important today not simply because they are young in age or large in numbers; their significance to America is far more qualitative. Young people are important because they, more than any other contemporary group

in society, are criticizing today's America. And in the process of that critique, they are forging the questions and themes for the America of tomorrow: "How can we find ways to revive a sense of community in America? How is it possible to have more meaning in work and leisure? How can we find ways to allow citizens greater participation in institutions that govern them?"

This generation is the first product of a broadly affluent society. It has a unique perspective on both the rewards and dangers of affluence, a perspective we hope that all of America will someday come to share. The younger generation's critique today may well be all of America's critique tomorrow. The ability to respond to criticism and questioning is the mark of a healthy society. To become different from what we are, we must have an awareness of where we are and where we're going. Our young people can help to provide this awareness if the government is willing to provide the requisite mechanisms for participation.

We realize that no single mechanism will meet the need. Therefore we have recommended a variety of specific actions:

- *A Special Assistant or Office within the Executive Office of the President* would provide a focal point for young people within the governmental framework.
- *A National Advisory Commission on Youth* would provide a widespread nationally visible group of citizens to focus on youth problems and to develop specific proposals.
- *Offices of Youth Affairs in Departments and Agencies* would help the executive branch to better understand and utilize the talents and energies of youth.
- *A Review of the Training Process for Young Federal Employees* would facilitate the ease of access of youth into the Federal Government.
- *The President's Students in Residence Program* would bring a number of college juniors to Washington for a series of frank and open discussions with Government leaders.
- *The Appointment of Youth to Advisory Committees* would augment youth's representation in important policy decisions.
- *The Encouragement of Governor's and Mayor's Fellows Programs* would provide a means for youth participation at all levels of government.

- *A Cooperative Policy Study Program* would bring to bear youth's academic talent on questions of Federal policy.
- *A National Television Series* would expose citizens throughout the Nation to the concerns of a younger generation.

Each of these recommendations outlines a different mechanism for increasing participation and understanding between the Federal Government and the student community. Any one of these recommendations can be implemented independently, but we urge that the total package be considered as a composite recommendation for attacking a problem of major national importance. Finally, it should be noted that the sense of urgency through the country can be a stimulus for action on the recommendations in this report.

II. BASIC FINDINGS

1. Inadequate channels of communications: We found at the outset a widely shared feeling among many different groups of students that the channels of communication between the Federal Government and the student community are inadequate. The frustration is easy to observe; the reasons for it are more difficult to ascertain. It is our impression that to many, young and old, black and white, today's communications problem is symptomatic of a more pervasive problem: a general weakening of the sense of community in the twentieth century.

When people share a common sense of community, purpose, and values, they find little difficulty in communicating relevant feelings, ideas and perceptions. In a climate of trust and openness, attitudes can be expressed and opinions exchanged and debated. A community is ordinarily defined as a body of people who share a common set of values and abide by a common interpretation of a system of laws and institutions. Measured against these two elements—values and institutions—the lack of community between the Government and the students is thrown in sharp, if somewhat exaggerated, relief.

Lack of a sense of shared values: In earlier times, parents could be relatively sure that their children would confront essentially the same society. No such certainty exists today. In our

technological age, virtually everything is constantly changing, even the givens upon which children are brought up.

As long as the Depression and poverty were oppressive facts to the majority of our parents, as long as millions could not get decent jobs, minimal education or adequate housing, the quest for economic security could not be ignored. When struggles to secure private goods—a decent home, a car, and a plot of grass—were all consuming struggles, the fight for public values understandably took second place. Yet when economic security, adequate education and decent housing could be accepted as givens, a different set of priorities could be defined—the search for community; the emphasis on intrinsic meaning in work; the quest for relevant education—and a greater emphasis on public values could be afforded.

The institutional gap: Institutional development traditionally lags behind social values. Today this lag has assumed extraordinary proportions with the exponential rate of social and political change in the twentieth century. In earlier times, institutions could be changed incrementally by the gradual inflow of changing values from new generations. Yet today when those values change so fundamentally within such short periods of time, the institutions are left breathless in the mad rush to stay relevant.

We pretend no exclusiveness in our interpretation of the elements involved in the sharp disjunction between the students and the government. We highlight these two to emphasize a common syndrome: kaleidoscopic change, shifts in values and beliefs, outmoded institutions resistant to change, pressures building to produce the needed changes.

2. Youth activism and the new politics: At this juncture, the struggle for changing our institutions to meet our shifting values is manned for the most part by the younger generation. In part this phenomenon can be attributed to the university, a specialized subculture which sets large numbers of young people apart from the mainstream of American society. In part it can be attributed to the simple question of time: because he doesn't have such pressing concerns about earning an income, raising a family and developing a career, the young person can take the time to look

at the system, question it and attempt to change it before becoming a part of it.

Among the younger generation of activist students, the attempt to bring about change in our institutional structures has generally taken one of two forms: the politics of confrontation and the politics of participation.

Confrontation politics is characterized by a belief that American institutions are incapable of changing by working from within, and by the conclusion that the system as a monolithic whole must be confronted head on and brought to a halt before any real changes can be instituted. As a consequence, traditional political methods are denigrated; political leadership and alliances are distrusted and seen as selling out. Morality and politics are considered incompatible, and the expression of protest assumes symbolic value. The style of protest becomes more important than the content, and this in turn evokes backlash from insiders.

Public attention is then diverted from the real issues involved to the "outlandish" behavior of the dissenters.

Participatory politics is characterized by a belief that American institutions can be changed one by one by working within the system. It reflects an ultimate belief in the rationality of the electorate and of the leaders, all of whom can be persuaded of the need for fundamental changes in our society. It is based on a belief that institutions can be structured to reflect the desires and needs of human beings, and that institutions are malleable if the work is done to change them. The contemporary flavor of participatory politics contains a mixture of pragmatism and idealism. There is an element of practical politics in the willingness to recognize that allies can be found throughout the system, and not in one small grouping alone. There is an element of idealism in the belief that compromises on means cannot rationalize compromises on principles.

3. Patterns: An example of both the politics of confrontation and the politics of participation can be seen in the civil rights struggles in 1961–63. When discriminatory Southern laws were at issue, certain forms of civil disobedience—sit-ins, marches, and

picketing—became prominent forms of action to produce change. These forms helped both to produce a wave of conscience throughout the Nation, and to initiate the Civil Rights Act, the Voting Rights Act, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development. At the same time, with the widespread participation of college students in freedom schools and voter registration, the potential participatory force of the college student body became a reality; the early experiences with power produced real changes.

However, as the civil rights arena shifted from the South to the North, the problems of producing change became far more complex. One-shot marches were no longer deemed a satisfactory response. Impatience, bitterness and frustration set in. Feelings grew that speaking out was no longer enough and that democratic channels were no longer effective. New forms of protest emerged; blacks and whites split apart; black power rallies came to replace the Mississippi summer project. The backlash was predictable and a vicious cycle had begun; the more militant forms of protest would produce repressive reactions. These reactions in turn would evoke further lawlessness and irresponsibility on the part of the young people.

Similar patterns can be detected in a number of different arenas: the Free Speech movement in Berkeley, the teach-ins on the war, and the forms of protest against the draft. None of these issues could be dealt with easily, nor did they seem susceptible to widespread citizen input in the decision making process. In frustration, protestors began turning more and more to symbolic forms of protest, shifting their focus from the Vietnam policy to the members of the Administration and then to the indirect representatives of the war effort such as Dow Chemical, or turning from the draft to the symbols of the draft, such as the draft card and Navy recruiters. The more symbolic the issue raised, the less the chance for resolution. Again the cycle of frustration, militancy and backlash set in.

In the 1968 presidential campaign, a different pattern emerged. The tremendous energies of youth were captured in the Republican and Democratic primaries; thousands of previously alienated young people turned away from the politics of confrontation to embrace the politics of participation. Responsible leadership developed; procedures for working within the system

opened up; personal commitment deepened and matured. Millions of Americans, young and old, were touched by the determination and enthusiasm of the young.

4. Choices: Whether we move toward increasingly violent confrontations with the system, attempting to tear down our institutions through dramatic confrontations and force, or whether we move toward a broader participatory democracy capable of producing meaningful change in a peaceful manner will depend in large part on three factors:

The type of leadership that emerges: If participatory democracy is to become a viable force, responsible and creative leadership is critical in both the Establishment and in the youth community: leadership with the sensitivity to recognize the urgency of our times; leadership with the foresight to anticipate changing demands; leadership with the courage to repudiate extremism and violence; leadership with the maturity to recognize that the process of producing change is a long and tedious one. The promised land may not lie around the corner but in time, through hundreds of small efforts, new attitudes can be shaped and cultivated.

The development of new procedures to open up the process of change to those urging change: Opening up the process of change is no easy matter. It involves decentralization and redistribution of power if it means anything at all. Neither cooptation nor token participation will suffice. Yet it may well be that this direct participation and involvement in the process of change is the best and only hope for developing an inner sense of responsibility among those urging change. And this inner sense of responsibility may well be the best guarantee for securing peace in this divided land.

The degree of sustained personal commitment: Dramatic one-shot commitments are much easier to make than ordinary everyday ones. Mass protests and demonstrations are less tedious than sustained personal efforts to change individual attitudes and feelings. But it may well be that man cannot produce change in the system until he has produced changes in the attitudes of the hundreds of thousands of men who make up that system.

Each of these individual efforts, taken by itself, may be of little importance in the grand scheme of things. Yet unless we achieve a greater peace and understanding among ourselves about the need for change, fancy rhetoric about turning the system around will remain just that, "full of sound and fury, signifying nothing."

With these factors—leadership, procedures and personal commitment—as our benchmark, we recommend a series of actions that the Government might take to open the path for more constructive participation by youth.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

We urge the following actions neither as remedial solvents to a "youth problem" nor as techniques to create a new cadre of "youth bureaucrats" but rather as steps to open the Government to a greater utilization of the talents, energies, spirit and idealism of its younger generation. We make no brief for setting youth aside *qua* youth for special treatment. Young people are important today not simply because they are young in age or large in numbers; their significance to America is far more qualitative. Young people are important because they, more than any other contemporary group in society, are criticizing today's America. And in the process of that critique, they are forging the questions and themes for the America of tomorrow: How can we finds ways to revive a sense of community in America? How is it possible to have more meaning in work and leisure? How can we find ways to allow citizens greater participation in the institutions that govern them?

This generation is the first product of a broadly affluent society. It has a unique perspective on both the rewards and dangers of affluence, a perspective we hope that all of America will someday come to share. The younger generation's critique today may well be all of America's critique tomorrow. The ability to respond to criticism and questioning is the mark of a healthy society. To become different from what we are, we must have an awareness of where we are and where we're going. Our young people can help to provide this awareness if the government is willing to provide the requisite mechanisms for participation.

We realize that no single mechanism will meet the need. Appealing as it might be, a single package or an easily defined program cannot be created *de novo*. Therefore we are recommending a variety of actions. A preliminary discussion of these recommendations follows:

1. A Special Assistant or Office Within the Executive Office of the President

Appointment of a Special Assistant to the President for youth affairs would be designed to channel the concerns of youth to the highest levels of Government and to oversee the development of a number of projects relating to youth.

Such an appointment would be an important first step for the Government to take in establishing a tone of receptivity to young people and an atmosphere of openness to new ideas and criticism.

The functions of the Special Assistant could include the following:

(1) Reaching out to where the young people are—on the campuses and in the cities—for suggestions, legislative recommendations and critiques of existing youth programs;

(2) Encouraging young people to testify before the Congress on matters of direct and indirect concern to them;

(3) Encouraging the appointment of youth to advisory committees;

(4) Examining the ways in which electoral regulations and registration procedures contribute to the extremely low voting participation rate of young people; stimulating continuous public discussion on the 18 year old vote;

(5) Coordinating the development of offices of youth in departments and agencies;

(6) Overseeing a full-scale evaluation of the training process for young Federal employees;

(7) Serving as the President's representative for the development of the various programs outlined in this report, such as the cooperative policy study program and the national television series.

It is inadvisable to define further the functions of the Special Assistant. Suffice it to say that the role would change with the personality of both the Assistant and the President, with the goals of the Administration and with the concerns of the national youth constituency.

Over time, as the demands and responsibilities of this position become clear, it is hoped that it would evolve into an Office of Youth Affairs within the Executive Office. The eventual functions of this office might well include all of the programs that have major youth involvement: Peace Corps, Teacher Corps, VISTA, the President's Council on Youth Opportunity, the Neighborhood Youth Corps and perhaps some of the youth programs in the Department of Agriculture.

2. A National Advisory Commission on Youth

The concerns of youth in the United States need continuous high level review and understanding. To accomplish this, it is recommended that the President establish a National Advisory Commission on Youth. This National Advisory Commission should be made up of prominent national figures known for their involvement with youth, and might include leading youth organization leaders, student body presidents, prominent young professionals, and other Americans known for their understanding of young people.

Initially the National Advisory Commission on Youth would have five primary functions. First, it would hold hearings on problems related to youth, in Washington and in various regions around the country. The Commission might even consider breaking into regional panels in order that its impact could be broadly spread. These hearings would cover such important and timely issues as the draft, youth involvement in poverty programs, youth-run community action programs, educational legislation, and so on. Hopefully these hearings could have significant impact nationally and within the communities where they might be held.

Second, the National Advisory Commission on Youth would report yearly to the President on the state of youth in the country. Such a report would be a social report on this vital segment of the population, and might also contain recommendations for new legislation or scholarly analyses of youth developments.

Third, the National Advisory Commission on Youth would help to encourage young people to participate in Congressional hearings on issues and legislation of special importance to the youth of the country.

Fourth, the National Advisory Commission on Youth would launch an investigation into the value and feasibility of combining existing youth-oriented programs into one office. This office, perhaps located in the Executive Office of the President, could serve as a loose umbrella for these disparate but related programs. Such an investigation would also yield helpful information for evaluating the various proposals for creating a national service program.

Fifth, the National Advisory Commission would launch the establishment of a Library of Youth programs. For the hundreds of youth programs established throughout the country, there is currently no sound mechanism for capturing the lessons of the most successful and transferring these to other locations.

3. The Establishment of Offices of Youth in Departments and Agencies*

The President should encourage Departments and Agencies to establish Offices of Youth Affairs. The shape of the Office of Youth within each Department should meet the style and mission of the Department. But it is hoped that each office would have access to the Cabinet officer, and would be developed on at least two criteria:

External functions: The staff of the Office of Youth should be able to reach out to the youth community across the country, to search for projects in line with the mission of that Department, and to receive the ideas of youth related to that mission.

Internal functions: The staff of the Office of Youth should have a central role in injecting the ideas and concerns of youth within the structure of the Department. This function might take many

*One model for such a departmental office exists within the Department of Labor, and much of this recommendation is based upon the success of this venture. The Coalition for Youth Action was set up within the Labor Department by Secretary Wirtz, to allow a group of young interns discretion to use a small amount of money. Grants were made to many youth groups with great success. This model might well be helpful to other Departments in setting up parallel offices of youth.

forms. The office might expedite youth proposals through the various administrations of a department. It might urge the appointment of young people to department advisory boards. It might hold seminars and lecture series for department employees, to expose career employees to the concerns and contributions of youth.

Beyond providing staff and office space, it is hoped that each Department would be able to set aside for youth projects a portion of those funds over which the Department has discretionary control. A small amount of money could be used to start youth projects, and to help eliminate the sometimes cumbersome application procedures that slow the development of innovative and often experimental projects.

4. Review of the Training Process for Young Employees in the Federal Service

The Chairman of the Civil Service should work with the Bureau of the Budget and the various Departments and Agencies to review the galaxy of intern and training programs which have proliferated throughout the government. In this age of constant change, theories and practices about recruiting, training and utilizing young employees must be frequently reexamined and revised.

Included in this review should be the programs for management interns, the Federal Service Entrance Trainees, young lawyers, young scientists and engineers, and summer interns.

A key element in the review process should be the full-scale participation of the interns in the evaluation process. Never before has this been done. Usually such evaluations proceed from the top down, involving the young people only in the end results. By involving them in the entire process from the very beginning, we hope to create a real sense of involvement and participation.

5. The "President's Students in Residence" Program

Following the suggestion of the President, the Fellows have outlined his proposal for a Junior Year program. This might be named "The President's Students in Residence" program.

This program might include 100 Juniors from college communities selected at random throughout the country. The random selection system should take into account the size of the colleges, their previous representation in the program, and the goal of eventually including in the program all of the colleges of the country.

The students in the selected colleges should have a major role in the choice of their representative. This process will vary from campus to campus, depending on the strength of student government, on the viability of other student organizations, on the willingness of faculty to participate, and on cooperation between the administration and the students.

Once selected, the students should engage in a period of intense preparation for the month that they will spend in Washington.

The program might be operated during a summer month. This would not interfere with the normal academic year, and in the cases where credit is given for the month, students would be relieved of some requirements during their senior year and provided with time to further explore their Washington interests.

Once in Washington, the students would live together in one complex. The initial week would be spent in general orientation to the Government, hopefully led by young Washington administrators. During this orientation period, the students would break into small issue teams, and begin to define the areas in which they were going to develop in-depth knowledge.

The middle two weeks would be spent on intensive work in the selected areas. The students would prepare position papers, and define the most incisive questions dealing with their chosen topics.

In the final week the students, in their issue teams, would meet with the Government executive or executives who have major responsibility for their area of interest. They would hold seminars discussing the issues and alternatives in depth, with the spirit of true interchange of ideas. These discussions should be open dialogues, with emphasis on student input. It is hoped that the resolution from these discussions might result in published papers regarding this particular area of national policy. This week might be capped by a reception at the White House, and an informal session with the President.

Upon his return to the campus, each student would be charged with developing a course or program, built around his experience

and knowledge in the field. This would, of course, vary from campus to campus depending on the policy of the college. But it is hoped that it would eventually result with a visit to that campus of the high Government official in the particular field of study. This visit might include a seminar with the students who had become involved with the issue, and perhaps a major presentation-dialogue with all interested students on the campus.

It is strongly recommended that the President's Students in Residence Program be developed so that participating students receive academic credit for their work.

6. The Appointment of Youth to National Advisory Committees

In order that the voice of youth may be heard, each of the advisory councils in the Federal Government that deal with problems which affect young people directly or indirectly should have a place set aside for youth representation.

Educational advisory committees provide a good example. In the summer of 1968, there were 27 relevant committees in the Office of Education. On none of these were young people represented. In other areas, such as the committees that advise the Housing and Urban Development Model Cities proposals, the councils that advise the Labor Department on Manpower Training and Neighborhood Youth Corps activities, and the councils that work with the poverty programs, young people should be represented.

The responsibility for the appointment of youth to various committees lies at all levels of Government. Within the Executive Office of the President, a review should be made of all Presidential Appointments, and of all Departmental appointments subject to Presidential review. Within each Department and Agency, the appointment process should include a built-in check for youth participation. The Congress should oversee appointed Commissions and Boards, to insure the representation of youth. And parallel efforts must be made at all other levels of Government.

The voice of youth must be heard and until youth is broadly represented, and until responsible administrators are accustomed to listening to young people, the gap which often exists between the views of youth and programs relevant to youth will remain.

7. The Encouragement of Governor's Fellows and Mayor's Fellows Programs

Representation on committees and councils at the Federal level is only the beginning. We must find ways to bring young people into the daily workings of city and State governments.

The White House Fellows program over the last 3 years has brought young people to work in Washington as assistants to Cabinet members and other top Administration officials. Evidence indicates that this program has been successful. After 3 years, it has matured to the point that it can serve as a model for similar State and local programs.

Responsibility for the establishment of such programs clearly lies within the offices of the State and local officials, and the communities which they serve. The White House Fellows stand ready, as a national body with broad geographical dispersion, to aid governmental units to establish counterpart programs, or to aid any national organization which might undertake the stimulation of Governor's and Mayor's Fellows programs. We recommend that the President's representative to the Mayors and Governors be urged to work with the Commission on White House Fellows to develop such programs.

8. A Cooperative Policy Study Program

The proposal for a cooperative policy study program grows out of two concerns which traditionally have not been related: (1) The number of difficult and complex policy questions facing all parts of the Federal Government which require careful study both within the government and from an outside perspective; and (2) the desirability of more closely involving students over the country in these problems.

This proposal would bring the Government and the students into a mutually exciting and beneficial relationship by directly involving the students in study and research on the Government's major policy questions. This could be done by establishing a cooperative relationship between various Federal agencies and interested university student groups.

The process would be quite simple. A Government agency and student group would agree on a policy problem for study. The

group would be briefed on the problem in Washington by the cooperating agency in the fall. The group would then spend the remainder of the academic year researching and analyzing the problem, perhaps with the help of visits from officials of the cooperating agency. It would prepare findings and recommendations and make a final report to the agency at an agreed-upon time later in the year.

This idea has significant advantages for both partners. The Government agency would have a problem considered and defined, and recommendations will flow from a new source. The university students would have experience working with Government on real problems of particular interest to them and would clearly be participating in the process of policy development.

A demonstration of the feasibility and value of the cooperative policy study idea started this autumn through an arrangement between the School of Social Service Administration of the University of Chicago and the Social and Rehabilitation Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Under this arrangement a group of students in social welfare policy, led by a former White House Fellow now on the faculty of the University of Chicago, will spend the year in a credit seminar studying the implications of federalizing the nation's public assistance programs. The student group will report its findings and recommendations to the SRS in the spring.

This project might serve as a model for other schools and other disciplines. It might be possible for a number of schools and disciplines to work on a number of problems, or on several facets of the same problem, during the same academic year. The students' findings and recommendations could be presented together, perhaps in competition, at the end of the academic year.

9. A National Television Series

A semimonthly, hour-long television series should be established on which young people discuss with America's chief decisionmakers the issues and problems which face all America today. The series would accomplish three purposes: to allow America's youth to ask their now unanswered questions; to open channels of communication between the youth and the leaders; and to provide a forum for discussion of major issues facing the United

States. Suggestions for the form, organization and direction of the series are outlined below. Implementation and modification of the suggestions are naturally left to the discretion of the television network sponsoring the series.

A National Executive Board should plan and choose programs, choose a moderator, and direct the series. The Board should be selected from broadly based student organizations, broadly based nonstudent youth organizations, and youth at large.

Program topics should be decided upon by the Board. There are many possible sources for programs: major colleges and universities should be contacted to sponsor programs that could be filmed by local stations; youth groups should be encouraged to plan topics and arrange speakers of interest to them; roving reporters might suggest possible topic areas; the Board itself should be able to respond to any newsworthy issues or crises needing discussion.

The actual programs should be set in an informal situation conducive to meaningful discussion. The goal of the youth participation is to present the highest quality of ideas possible, not necessarily the widest spread of opinions on every topic. In other words, depending upon the nature of the discussion topic, there might be all political activists or all ROTC members, or a mixture. The aim is incisive discussion, not bland or time-worn arguments. Also, the program might feature more than one statesman or official, depending on the nature of the topic.

Suggestions for program topics include the following: the peace keeping role of the United States, the draft, education in America, the urban crisis, alienation of youth, and the American governmental process.

It is suggested that members of Congress, key executives, and the President, appear on the program in order to keep in contact with the youth, and to develop a national awareness of the responsiveness of leadership to the concerns of youth.

The program series can be made even more meaningful by establishing follow-up programs. Colleges, universities and high schools across the country should be encouraged to establish seminars and discussion sections around the issues and personalities presented and to submit ideas for future programs.

Responsibility for the establishment of such a series lies with the networks, but they can certainly be encouraged by the Presi-

dent's expressed willingness to participate were such a series established.

IV. APPENDIX: THE RESEARCH EFFORT

The White House Fellows Program. On October 3, 1964, President Johnson announced the establishment of the White House Fellows program. This program was to bring a number of young (23 to 35 years of age) men and women to Washington to provide them with "firsthand, high-level experience with the workings of the Federal Government and to increase their sense of participation in national affairs."

The Fellows were to be young people from business, law, education, journalism, and other occupations, who had exhibited leadership and commitment in their fields and in their community. After a year in Washington these young people would return to their communities with a broader perspective on social problems, and an increased understanding of the leadership roles needed in our society.

To establish a program the President established a Commission on White House Fellows, chaired by David Rockefeller, and composed of leading Americans from the public and private sectors. The Commission established an application and selection procedure, keyed to regions around the country, and totally nonpolitical in its process. The first group of Fellows started their year in Washington in September, 1965.

The fourth group of Fellows started in September, 1968. Fellows are assigned to the White House and other offices in the Executive Office of the President, and a Fellow serves in each Department as a special assistant to each member of the Cabinet.

The 49 former White House Fellows, realizing that their year in Washington should not be an end in itself, but rather should be a jumping off spot for greater community leadership and involvement, have formed an Association. This report is the first product of that Association, and was developed during the summer months of 1968. The Executive Committee of the Association solicited and studied the recommendations of all the Fellows.

The Research Process. The 49 members of the White House Fellow Association are listed on a following page. Their geographi-

cal locations indicate the scope of the research effort, though Fellows' contact with university communities was by no means limited to their hometown areas. A list of universities contacted is also attached.

Since young people were to be involved in any recommended program, the Fellows felt that these young people should play the major role in developing the report. Consequently the Fellows stressed student contact in their visits to universities. At the same time, however, they tried to obtain faculty and administration comment, and thus present a final package that would reflect the views of the total university community.

The response and interest among the students in particular were rewarding, and most of the Fellows have commented on the amount which they learned from their visits. Students almost uniformly expressed a sense of frustration about their lack of contact with the administration of the Federal Government. In most discussions, this frustration was talked out, and was then followed by student presentation of a number of creative and interesting ideas to bridge what all felt was a gap in understanding and communication. The recommendations are a synthesis of these suggestions.

Colleges and Universities Contacted

Interviews were conducted by members of the White House Fellows Association with students, faculty and administrators at the following educational institutions:

Arkansas State College
Adelphi University
Bowdoin College
Bowling Green State University
Brigham Young University
Baltimore University
Colby College
Columbia University
Colgate University
Cedar Crest College
California Institute of Technology
Carleton College
City College of New York
Catholic University, Washington, D.C.
Dartmouth College
Dallas University
East New Mexico University, Roswell
East New Mexico University, Portales
Florida A. & M. University
Fayetteville State College
Goucher College
Howard University
Harvard University
Immaculate Heart College
Indiana University
Johns Hopkins University
Loyola University
Middlebury College
Marquette University
Morgan State College
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Notre Dame University
Oregon State University
Occidental College, Los Angeles
Purdue University
Richmond Professional Institute
Southern Methodist University
Stanford University
Sarah Lawrence College
Swarthmore College
Shippensburg State College
Tufts University
Texas Southern University
Texas Christian University
Tuskegee Institute
Transylvania College
University College of Los Angeles
University of Alabama
University of California at Berkeley
University of California at Los Angeles
University of California at Santa Barbara
University of Chicago
University of Kansas
University of Maine
University of Michigan
University of Minnesota
University of Missouri at Columbia
University of Missouri at Kansas City
University of New Hampshire

Colleges and Universities Contacted—Continued

University of New Mexico
University of North Dakota
University of Oregon
University of Pittsburgh
University of South Carolina
University of Texas
University of Utah
University of Vermont
University of Wisconsin
Utah State College
Vassar College
Wesleyan College
Western Maryland College
Wheaton College
William and Mary College
Yale University

Membership of The White House Fellows Association, 1965–1968

(Includes present location and place of assignment as a White House Fellow)

WILLIAM S. ABBOTT
Arlington, Massachusetts
Department of Agriculture

WALTER S. BAER
Washington, D.C.
Office of the Vice President

RICHARD E. BALZHISER
Ann Arbor, Michigan
Department of Defense

JOHN W. BASSETT, Jr.
Roswell, New Mexico
Department of Justice

JANE P. CAHILL
Rye, New York
Department of HUD

RICHARD D. COPAKEN
Adelphi, Maryland
The White House; Department of Transportation

WILLIAM R. COTTER
New York, New York
Department of Commerce

THOMAS E. CRONIN
Chapel Hill, North Carolina
The White House

BARBARA CURRIER
Washington, D.C.
Office of the Vice President

JOHN A. DELUCA
Belmont, California
The White House

RICHARD L. DE NEUFVILLE
Boston, Massachusetts
Department of Defense

JAN T. DYKMAN
Alexandria, Virginia
Department of Commerce

BARNES H. ELLIS
Portland, Oregon
Department of Justice

EDWIN B. FIRMAGE
Salt Lake City, Utah
Office of the Vice President

JOSEPH FREITAS, Jr.
Washington, D.C.
Department of HUD

DONALD A. FURTADO
Atlanta, Georgia
The White House

JOHN E. HAVELOCK
Anchorage, Alaska
Department of Agriculture

SAMUEL H. HOWARD
New York, New York
The United Nations

WILLIAM P. GRAHAM
Hartsdale, New York
The White House

SANFORD D. GREENBERG
Washington, D.C.
The White House

Membership of the White House Fellows Association, 1965–1968—Continued

ROBERT P. HUEFNER
Cambridge, Massachusetts
Department of the Treasury

WALTER J. HUMANN
Dallas, Texas
Post Office Department

THOMAS O. JONES
New York, New York
Department of HEW

W. THOMAS JOHNSON, Jr.
Alexandria, Virginia
The White House

DORIS KEARNS
Washington, D.C.
Department of Labor; The White House

PETER F. KROGH
Medford, Massachusetts
Department of State

ROBERT R. LEE
Boise, Idaho
Bureau of the Budget

RONALD B. LEE
Potomac, Maryland
Post Office Department

BETSY LEVIN
Washington, D.C.
The United Nations

F. PIERCE LINAWEAVER
Baltimore, Maryland
Department of the Interior

CHARLES M. MAGUIRE
Chevy Chase, Maryland
The White House

JAMES P. MALONEY, Jr.
Washington, D.C.
Department of Commerce

JOHN W. MCCARTER, Jr.
Evanston, Illinois
Bureau of the Budget

J. TIMOTHY MCGINLEY
Bethesda, Maryland
Department of Labor

JOHN M. MCGINTY
Houston, Texas
Department of the Interior

DAVID C. MULFORD
London, England
Department of the Treasury

HOWARD N. NEMEROVSKI
San Francisco, California
Department of HEW

HOWARD N. NEWMAN
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Bureau of the Budget

ROBERT E. PATRICELLI
Woodacres, Maryland
Department of State

Lt. Col. JOHN S. PUSTAY
Alexandria, Virginia
Department of State

CHARLES D. RAVENEL
New York, New York
Department of the Treasury

HAROLD A. RICHMAN
Chicago Illinois
Department of Labor

Membership of the White House Fellows Association, 1965–1968—Continued

HAROLD P. SMITH, Jr.
Berkeley, California
Department of Defense

GERARD L. SNYDER
New York, New York
Department of Transportation

PRESTON M. TOWNLEY
Minneapolis, Minnesota
Post Office Department

THOMAS VEBLEN
Minneapolis, Minnesota
Department of the Interior

MICHAEL H. WALSH
Portland, Oregon
Department of Agriculture

TIMOTHY E. WIRTH
Washington, D.C.
Department of HEW

KIMON S. ZACHOS
Manchester, New Hampshire
Department of Justice

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1968 O—323-989

The White House Fellows express appreciation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for administrative support and for assistance in the printing of this report.